

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PROBLEMS OF AUTHORSHIP IN ELIZABETHAN DRAMATIC LITERATURE

The ground for the present discussion has to be cleared first by a determination of the period, and secondly, by a determination of what is to be reckoned as drama. As to the former, the closing of the theaters in September, 1642, affords a clear and definite end-date; but the beginning-date is not so easily settled. To go back to the production of our first known play would not only needlessly extend the period, but would leave us with a somewhat uncertain date to start from. Moreover the date would be liable to be pushed back by the discovery of some yet older drama, and even then there would be no guarantee that that play had not had a predecessor. To begin so far back would also mean the inclusion of a mass of literature not characterized by what we consider "Elizabethan" qualities. If there be objections to taking as our starting-point the probable date of production of the earliest known drama, there is even less to be said in favor of the usual course of taking the date of Elizabeth's accession to the throne. It is true that her name is usually given to the literature of the period, though it extended far beyond the limits of her reign, but the mere fact of her accession had little or no bearing on the dramatic art, and the literature with which her name is associated cannot be said to have come into being till many years later. If, because the literature is styled Elizabethan, we date it from 1558, we ought to end it at 1603. A better commencement-date is 1574, when the first royal patent for a company of players was granted, or 1576, when the first regular theater was built; but, if we want the closest possible dates including all of real literary and dramatic value in the theatrical work of the time, from the presentation of the first of Lyly's plays in or about 1579 to the production of Shirley's *Cardinal* in 1641, a better beginning-date than either is 1578, in which year was published Whetstone's forecast of the lines on which the great dramatists were to achieve their mighty work—the work of which Whetstone himself was inca-

pable. Whether by reason of its closeness to Lyly's arrival upon the scene or from the point of view of literary and dramatic development, this seems to be the best starting-point to be found. Let us then begin the period with the work of a critic who wrote drama not meant for the stage and close it with the annihilating legislation of those who hated it and were determined to end it.

Next I must state as briefly as possible what species of the literary work of the period I have regarded as coming within the scope of my consideration. I have had no hesitation in including every original English work intended for the stage if it has action and a plot, and even such as have a mere thread of story connecting a lot of scattered incidents, as is the case in *Four Plays in One* or the three "Parnassus" plays. On the other hand I have had no hesitation in omitting all those pseudo-dramatic pieces that are mere conglomerations of separate scenes, such as *The Parliament of Bees*, or again those that are only dialogues for perusal, as is Rowlands' *'Tis Merry When Gossips Meet*. But between these certain "ins" and certain "outs" there is an equal number of classes of more or less dramatic work concerning which opinions may well vary. With some hesitation I have decided to disregard dialogues for representation (such as *The Muses' Looking-Glass*, *Aristippus*, *Summer's Last Will*, *The World Tost at Tennis*, and *Spring's Glory*) and also that other species of quasi-dramatic production that forms a mere setting for a dance in which the audience may take part—a class that includes every so-called masque except Milton's *Comus*, Shirley's *Triumph of Beauty*, and Nabbes' *Microcosmus*, which have regular plots and are not really masques at all. A play such as Peele's *Arraignment*, having a regular plot in which a member of the audience has a place, is only semi-dramatic; and so too are compositions that differ from plays only in not being intended for the stage; but both of these classes I have included. On these lines, and taking stock only of plays in English (wherever acted or published), excluding translations (but not adaptations) by such as have to their credit no extant play at least partly original, including no literal prose translations whatever, and, where there is a doubt as to whether or not a play comes within the prescribed period, following the probabilities, but omitting no play in which they are evenly balanced, we

have 599 or 600 dramatic and semi-dramatic works to deal with, my doubt as to the exact number being due to my ignorance whether or not *Demetrius and Marsina* is extant. I may add that I have not excluded any play because in its first form it certainly or probably dates back to a time anterior to 1578, so long as it is clear that some portion of the work falls within the period specified.

A word as to my object. It is not to attempt the settlement of questions of authorship, but to state what those questions are, and to classify them according to the value of the external evidence. Of the internal evidence I take no account except in one or two special cases, and my own views are not obtruded. There will thus be found in the following pages little that is original, but the writer hopes that what he has to say will prove helpful to others who may be tempted to enter the field of inquiry on which he has himself ventured twice or thrice and may aid them in a selection from amongst the problems that await solution. There are many plays of the period commonly treated as of assured authorship though their ascription to this or that dramatist rests on evidence of but little value. To direct attention to these may perhaps lead to fruitful investigations by students with time and inclination for such pursuits.

I

The first problem of authorship that calls aloud to the student is that of the altogether anonymous plays—the plays that have never been connected with the name of any dramatist on any sixteenth- or seventeenth-century evidence. They are not very numerous, amounting to only 49 in all (or 50, if *Demetrius and Marsina* be extant). Some of these are not worth bothering about, and some I have not seen, but there are a few that either from their intrinsic merits or from the place they occupy in the history of the development of the drama are entitled to attention. *Cyrus*, *Jack Straw*, *Leir*, *The True Tragedy*, and *Love and Fortune* are early plays that are very reasonably supposed to be joint works of our first generation of dramatists. *A Warning* and *A 'Larum* have been credited to Lodge, perhaps rightly, though the reasons for the attribution amount to little more than guesswork. Of the authorship of the non-Shaksperean *Richard II*, *Swetnam*, *London Chanticleers*, and

Knack to Know an Honest Man no opinion, so far as I am aware, has been expressed; while the views propounded concerning *Dick of Devonshire*, *Stukeley*, *Wily Beguiled*, and *Charlemagne* do not seem to have met with general acceptance. Professor Quinn has pointed out the likeness of *The Fair Maid of Bristow* to various other plays, without, however, making any suggestion as to the authorship; and finally the German editor of *The Queen* has ascribed that tragi-comedy to Forde. Of these plays, the early *Love and Fortune*, *Richard II*, *Richard III*, *Leir*, *Cyrus*, and *Jack Straw*, the middle-period *Warning*, *'Larum*, *Wily*, and *Stukeley*, the later *Dick* and *Swetnam*, and the still later *Queen* are the ones particularly recommendable for study. Every one of them is worth it—one or two of them on their merits, others for their connection with other plays, their early date, or the probabilities of their being joint works, with the chances of one or other of the great writers being concerned in their production. The determination of the authorship of even the least important of them is a matter of some consequence; but not even the most important has so strong a claim to the attention of the student as some of those yet to be mentioned. Before proceeding, however, it may be well to name the remaining plays of this class, some of which I have not seen, and as to the merits of which I am therefore entirely ignorant. They are *Antonio of Ragusa*, *Belleosa* (perhaps of later date), *Birth of Hercules*, *Caesar's Revenge*, *Claudius Tiberius Nero*, *Costly Whore*, *Cruel War*, *Cyprian Conqueror* (perhaps later than 1642), *Diana's Grove*, *Edmund Ironside* (perhaps of later date), *Fatal Marriage* (ditto), *Female Rebellion*, *Ghost*, *Grobiana's Nuptials* (perhaps later than 1642), *Love's Changelings* (ditto), *Love's Victory*, *Lady Alimony*, *Liberality and Prodigality* (perhaps of earlier date), *Narcissus*, *Nobody*, *Partial Law*, *Pedlar's Prophecy* (attributed to Wilson senior, because of its likeness to that dramatist's *Cobbler's Prophecy*), *Pelopidarum Secunda* (the MS of which in the British Museum is plentifully sprinkled with the date October 16, 1725, though the contents of the volume in which it appears are in a sixteenth-century hand and include Donne's Satires), *Señor Hidalgo*, *Sight and Search* (perhaps of later date), *Tell Tale*, *Timon*, *Trial of Chivalry* (as to the authorship of which there has been more than one unconvincing guess), *Two*

Noble Ladies, *Weakest Goeth to the Wall* (which Mr. Fleay has ascribed without much reason to Mundy), *Welsh Ambassador*, *Wit of a Woman*, and *Wizard*.

II

There is another class of anonymous play—that concerning the authorship of which there is no direct evidence, but with which there is more or less good reason to connect some particular dramatist or dramatists. Of these, *Histriomastix* may be inferred to be Marston's inasmuch as it contains many of the words which Jonson in the *Poetaster* accused Crispinus of using, Crispinus being shown to be intended for Marston by his acknowledgment of the authorship of passages from *Antonio and Mellida* and *Jack Drum's Entertainment*. The play seems to me to be only in part Marston's, there being perhaps two other writers present. *Dr. Dodipoll* is connected with the name of Peele by the fact that a song in it is found in Drummond's extracts from Peele's *Hunting of Cupid;* but, whereas the inference in the case of *Histriomastix* is exceedingly strong, that which would attribute to Peele any share in *Dr. Dodipoll* is particularly weak. *The General* bears the name of a play for which Shirley wrote a prologue, but even if it be identifiable with that production it does not follow that Shirley was the author. In his capacity as manager of the Dublin theater at which it was produced, he may well have been called on to introduce it to the public with a few lines. *The Famous Victories* contains an amount of clowning that Mr. Fleay is probably right in attributing to Tarlton, inasmuch as that comedian played the clown in it and is known to have been an improvisor of clowning scenes. *Pathomachia* may be supposed to be Tomkins', inasmuch as it is not only written on the same plan as that author's *Lingua*, but in its first scene has "Methinks it were fit now to renew the claim to our old title of affections which we have lost, as sometimes Madame Lingua did to the title of a sense." It is quite compatible with this allusion to look upon the author of the play as a mere imitator of Tomkins, but the two are more likely to have been identical. *The Lady Mother* contains many phrases common to Glapthorne, and has been plausibly conjectured to be the play that was entered in the Stationers' Register as his under the title of *Noble Trial*. Of these six plays the one whose authorship

most calls for determination is *Dr. Dodipoll*, because of the occasional poetry that illumines its general dullness; but *Pathomachia* and *The Lady Mother* may also be recommended, and so may the three other plays of the class that have yet to be considered.

Barnaveld is universally recognized on grounds of style to be the work of Fletcher and Massinger; their part authorship might in fact have been surmised from the circumstances that they were the regular poets of the King's Company, by whom this play was produced, and that about the same time they collaborated with Field in another Dutch play now lost. It is not a strong inference, but the evidence of style seems to be tolerably conclusive. *Soliman* is commonly awarded to Kyd; but the only ground for the ascription, save similarity of style, phraseology, and construction, is the identity of its story with that of the play within the play of Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*. Finally, there is *Sir Thomas More*, which Mr. Fleay awards to Lodge, on the ground that that writer acted the part of Suresby in it, but which has also been claimed in part for Shakspere as having been acted by the Chamberlain's Company and tinkered by the company's poet, who was certainly no other than Shakspere. This drama is particularly worthy of attention, for, though scarcely a great play, is has some magnificent passages. It may be worth while to point out to prospective students of it the number of short lines either beginning or ending speeches in scenes 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 17; the frequent doublings (reminiscent of *Titus*) in scenes 2, 5, 7*a* (Dyce, pp. 24–29), 14*c* (from servant's entry), 16; the couplets separated by short lines in scenes 11, 12; the habit of addressing characters by their full names in scenes 3, 6; the quotations from Seneca in scenes 12, 14; the fondness for "A' God's name!" in scenes 13, 15, 17, and the first part of 18; the likeness of 7*a* to the manner of Shakspere; the difference between the run of the verse in 10*b* (Dyce, pp. 53–68) and that of the verse elsewhere; and, finally, the spelling in 10*b*. The play is probably of composite authorship, and these matters have a direct bearing on the work of determining the responsibility for its various scenes.

III

There is another set of plays that is practically anonymous, the evidence for their authorship being almost worthless. *The Double*

Falsehood was published in 1728 by Theobald as Shakspere's, "revised and adapted to the stage" by Theobald himself! He may have had some old MS bearing Shakspere's name; but, again, he may not. Grosart attributes it, I know not on what grounds, to Shadwell. If his, it is of too late a date for inclusion here: indeed, we have only Theobald's word for it that it belongs to the period under review. *Philotus* is possibly, but improbably, identical with the drama of that name written by Lateware. *The Puritan*, published in Shakspere's lifetime as by "W. S," was included in the third folio of his works, having previously been attributed to him by Kirkman and Archer, but the two cataloguers were presumably misled by the initials on the 1607 quarto. The fact that the play was produced by Paul's children is almost conclusive against Shakspere's authorship. The writer, judging by the initials, may have been Wentworth Smith; but the critics favor Middleton and Rowley. There remain of this class half a dozen plays depending for their ascription to various authors entirely upon the attributions of one or other of the old cataloguers; so it is well before going farther to consider precisely what is the value to be attached to their entries.

There are three of them in all; and of the three it is Kirkman who counts for most, and rightly so. Putting aside those late plays in regard to which he must be held to be a first-class authority, his attributions (and the same may be said of the others') may be divided into three classes—those in which he followed the ascriptions on the title-pages, those in which he varied from such ascriptions, and those in which he provided names of authors for anonymous plays. Of these three classes, the entries belonging to the first do not matter, those of the second are as likely to be blunders as corrections of errors, and those of the third have a considerable value in some cases, the presumption being where the name of an author many years dead and not in high repute is given that there existed some copy with his name upon it. Kirkman never mentions any author in connection with Fletcher, never names Beaumont, and only on sixteen occasions ascribes a play to more than a single author, Rowley figuring in ten of these, Webster in five, Middleton in five, and Dekker in four. Archer never names more than a single author till his list has progressed to initial L, but thenceforward he makes an

exception in the case of Beaumont and Fletcher, the only two plays subsequently given wholly to Fletcher being really entirely his, whereas he alone has been mentioned for the joint plays in the early part of the list. Although the catalogue appears at the end of a play ascribed on the title-page to three writers it gives that play to one of the three only; therefore it is certain that the attributions are not meant to be regarded as complete. Rogers and Leys (spoken of henceforth as "R. and L.") once have "Beament Flet." to a play and on nine occasions "B.F." for the same pair of writers; in no other case is more than a single authorship hinted at. These facts are worth bearing in mind.

Langbaine essayed to be more than the compiler of a catalogue, and he undoubtedly took pains to be accurate, but it is to be noted that he never throws light on dark places, that he follows Kirkman almost invariably, and that he seems to consider an attribution on a title-page decisive. That being so, he need not be mentioned here more than occasionally.

All three of the cataloguers make a few glaring mistakes. Some are typographical, whereof no notice need be taken, and some are anachronistic, such as Kirkman's ascription of *The Fleire* to Marmion (which, however, may be due to the repetition of the name by a printer's blunder). These too may be ignored; but there remain a few that, while not impossible so far as date is concerned, are so convincingly contradicted as to be regarded indubitably as blunders. In some of these cases the cataloguers followed the title-pages of the old quartos: those in which they did not do so may as well be mentioned here and now. Kirkman gives *Apollo Shroving* to "E.W." (because it was "E.W." who gave that play to the press, though it is he who is our sufficient authority for its authorship by Hawkins); *Arraignment of Paris* to Shakspere; *Duchess of Suffolk* and the two *Robin Hood* plays to Heywood; *Princess* to Sir. W. Killigrew; *Three Lords*, in his later list, to "W. R." (he has "R.W." in his earlier one); and *Arthur* to Trotte. Archer awards *The Arraignment of Paris*, *Hoffman*, and *A Trick* to Shakspere; *Cynthia's Revenge* to one John Swallow (the cataloguer being misled probably, like a later critic, by F. C.'s commendatory verse referring to one swallow making a summer, the plain interpretation of which is merely that

an author may gain a reputation with a single play); *Duchess of Suffolk* to Heywood; *Faithful Shepherdess* to John Dymocke (the result of confusion with Dymocke's *Faithful Shepherd*); the two *Iron Age* plays to Dekker; *Noble Stranger* to Machin; *Octavia* to Thomas (instead of Samuel) Brandon, and the two *Passionate Lover* plays to "Lodowick Loyd" instead of Ludowick Carlell. R. and L. give *Bondman* twice, once rightly to Massinger, and the second time to Fletcher; *All's Lost* to Massinger; *Cynthia's Revels* to Fountaine (an amusing blunder); *False One* to Beaumont, and *Noble Stranger* and *Sophy* to Shirley. To make the list complete I may as well add the anachronistic blunders: Kirkman—*Selimus* to Goffe (his interpretation of the initials "T. G." on the quarto); Archer—*Lost Lady, New Inn,* and *Love's Cruelty* (owing to confusion with *Love's Cure,* which he also calls "Love's Cruelty") to Beaumont and Fletcher; *Selimus* to Goffe; the two early versions of the second and third parts of *Henry VI* to Sampson, and the second entry of *Love's Labor's Lost* (the first being given to Shakspere) to Sampson; R. and L.—*Unfortunate Lovers* to Beaumont and Fletcher. Archer is also unquestionably wrong in part in attributing to Beaumont as well as Fletcher the *Little French Lawyer, Lovers' Progress, Loyal Subject, Sea-Voyage, Spanish Curate, Wild-Goose Chase, Wife for a Month,* and *Woman's Prize;* and R. and L. err similarly in regard to *Island Princess, M. Thomas,* and *Pilgrim.*

But, it will be urged, there are many other mistakes made in all these catalogues. Doubtless; but in the other cases we only *infer* them to be mistakes, principally by the internal evidence of the plays themselves; we do not *know* them to be errors, as we do those named here. Every one of these will be mentioned when its time comes.

In regard to the half-dozen plays I am about to speak of, the ascriptions of the cataloguers are negligible because every one of them is to be accounted for by a confusion of ideas or by the proximity in the list of some other play attributed to the same author. Thus *Two Wise Men and All the Rest Fools* is given by Kirkman to Chapman, owing evidently to the similarity of its title to that of Chapman's *All Fools.* Similarly, Archer gives *Every Woman in Her Humor* to Jonson, the author of *Every Man in His Humor;* both Archer and R. and L. give *The Taming of a Shrew* to Shakspere

(though, as neither of them names *The Shrew*, the ascription may be in point of fact intended for Shakspere's play); and *The Maid's Metamorphosis* is given by Kirkman and Archer to Lyly, the author of *Love's Metamorphosis*. *Edward III* is flanked on each side by a (blundering) Shakspere entry in R. and L.'s list, and is given to Shakspere accordingly; and Archer names Bernard, the translator, as the author of *Arden*, the result probably of the propinquity of Bernard's *Andrea*. *Arden*'s claim to rank among even the Shakspere apocrypha is on external evidence absolutely *nil;* nor is it his on the internal evidence. Mr. Fleay long ago proclaimed Kyd's authorship, and Mr. Crawford has since made out a strong case for it; but while I also, working independently, came to the conclusion that Kyd was concerned in it, I was equally convinced of Marlowe's presence, and not at all certain that these two had it to themselves. Parts of the play are full of Marlowe parallels, although Mr. Bullen, who, as an editor of Marlowe, might have been supposed to be reasonably acquainted with his work, declared that the entire play offered but one. "With mighty furrows in his stormy brows" he thinks might have come straight out of *Tamburlaine* (one could quote half a dozen such lines from different sources); "but," he adds, "in no other part of the play can we find a trace of Marlowe's influence." It is amazing that he could have missed the numerous instances in which lines occurring in Marlowe's plays are found in *Arden*. As one of the finest and most effective tragedies of the period, there is scarcely any Elizabethan play more recommendable than *Arden* to anyone wishing to consider questions of authorship; but he must first steep himself in Marlowe, Kyd, Greene, and their contemporaries. It has been suggested that the play may be a recast of the *Murderous Michael* of 1578; but, as Michael is far from being either the most important or the most murderous character in the drama, the suggestion does not seem very plausible. It is more likely that the real name of the early play was *Murderous Machiavel*. Of *Edward III* and *A Shrew* it is also most desirable that the authorship should be ascertained. Though the external evidence of Shakspere's participation in either is of the slightest, I personally am a believer in his responsibility for Acts I and II of *Edward III*, from the meeting of the king and the countess onward

(with the exception of the first seven speeches of II, 2) and parts of III, 3 and 5 and IV, 4; but most of the critics who admit his presence confine it to the king and countess scenes. Anyway, all the rest of the play is still wanting an author or authors. There may be some basis for the attribution of *Maid's Metamorphosis* to Lyly, for it contains many resemblances to his work. The critics generally have inclined to accept a theory of Day's authorship.

IV

Leaving this class, of which *The Puritan, Maid's Metamorphosis, Arden, Edward III,* and *Taming of a Shrew* are the ones offering particular inducements to study, we turn to that class of plays concerning which we have a choice of authors, without any ascription rising above probability. This is a species of which the scope may prove to be smaller than that of those previously dealt with, inasmuch as the student's first endeavor would naturally be to see whether either of the named authors was concerned in the production, and only on finding that parts of the play could not thus be accounted for would the inquiry need to assume broader proportions. Two plays connected with Shakspere's name appear in this list, the one being *The Merry Devil,* which Kirkman and Archer ascribe to him and which was entered in the Stationers' Register in 1653 as his, but on a MS of which Drayton's name is said to have appeared; and the other *Pericles,* which was published in 1609 as Shakspere's but to which Wilkins seems to put in a claim. There can be no doubt, on the internal evidence, of Shakspere's part-authorship of the latter play; but it is well to remember that so far as the external evidence is concerned it is in no better case than *London Prodigal* or *Yorkshire Tragedy.* All three were published as Shakspere's during his lifetime, all were included in the third folio, and not one of them was included in the first; yet those good people who pooh-pooh the examination of plays with a view to determining questions of authorship do not hesitate to accept *Pericles* as entitled to a place in the Shakspere canon, and to deny places to the other two. It is a curious fact that both Shakspere and Wilkins are connected with two of these three plays—*Pericles* and *Yorkshire Tragedy.* But this is a digression; for the latter, like *London Prodigal,* must be dealt

with later. As to *The Merry Devil*, Drayton's authorship is by no means improbable, and those who will may infer from the resemblances between it and Shakspere's Falstaff trilogy some connection between Shakspere and this comedy or between Drayton and the other plays. That it has not come down to us in its original form is abundantly obvious, but to me at least the play seems the work of one man, and that one is presumably Drayton.

In 1647 was published *The Country Girl* as by "T. B." Kirkman interprets this Anthony Brewer; Archer, Thomas Brewer. The British Museum catalogue attributes it to the former; but Thomas Brewer is much the likelier. He wrote over the initials attached to this play, and issued a prose tract on the "Merry Devil of Edmonton"; so as the scene of part of *The Country Girl* is also Edmonton, his authorship of the play would have seemed probable, even had Archer not credited him with it. His work was evidently done early, and an examination of the play has convinced me that Massinger revised it, his share being parts of I, 1, the greater part of I, 2 (excluding the Old Gentleman's first speech), II, 1 (to "Enter 6 Country Wenches," the earlier part of it to "Exit Thrash" containing, however, matter not his), II, 2, parts of III, 1, IV, 1 (which is corrupt and perhaps of mixed authorship), the first 8 speeches of IV, 2, parts (perhaps all) of V, 1, and parts of V, 2, the rest of the play being the original author's. This is nothing more than a personal view, mentioned only to induce careful examination of the play by others with more time for the purpose and better qualifications for the work. Massinger's touch is very distinct and is clearly ascertainable from a study of the sixteen dramas published as his, of which *A Very Woman* is the only one that an examination does not show to be entirely his work.

The Bastard was published in 1652 with Goffe's name on some copies, but is attributed by Archer (and also by Coxeter) to Manuche, its right to inclusion here, if that ascription be correct, being very doubtful. *Guy of Warwick*, published in 1661 as by B. J. and perhaps identical with the play of the same name entered in the Stationers' Register as by Day and Dekker in 1619–20, does not call for much remark. Langbaine was told it was by Jonson, but doubted it. *Alphonsus of Germany*, published in 1654 as by Chapman, is

given by Kirkman to Peele, and there may be some good reason for the attribution. The MS from which it was printed may have borne the initials "G. P.," misread "G. C." I do not see that much is to be made of the argument that Chapman (or, for the matter of that, Peele) has nowhere else shown such knowledge of German as is displayed in this play: the answer is that a show of such knowledge would in the other plays of either author have been out of place. *Fortune by Land and Sea* was published in 1655 as by Heywood and Rowley, but it must not be overlooked that in 1637–38 there was entered in the Stationers' Register, as by Henry Shirley, "Martyr'd Souldier, with the Life and Death of Purser Clinton." *The Martyr'd Souldier* has nothing to do with Purser and Clinton, but this play has. Two plays must then have been entered together. Fleay accordingly assigns the Purser and Clinton scenes of *Fortune* to Henry Shirley. It seems to me probable that the ascription to Heywood and Rowley is due to a misreading of "Heywood Shirley" on the MS as "Heywood & Rowley."

In November, 1653, was entered in the Stationers' Register as by Glapthorne a play published the next year as Chapman's. This is *Revenge for Honor*. In the Register it is given a double title, the other being "The Parricide." There was a play of that name licensed for the Prince's Company in 1624. If this be identifiable with the existing play, Glapthorne can have been nothing more than a reviser, for 1624 is far too early a date for him. The prologue speaks of a single author. Is it possible that "Chapman" can be a misreading of "Glapthorn"? If so, it is well to bear in mind that there was a George as well as a Henry of that name, and "George Glapthorn" might easily be misread "George Chapman." That the "a" should be taken for "or" in the writing of the period would be easy enough. It is however, quite possible for "Henrye" to be so written as to be mistaken for "George." The known writers for the Prince's Company in 1624 are a Barnes (of whom nothing is known to have survived), Sampson, Brome, Forde, and Dekker.

Finally, there is the play which, for want of a title, is known as *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*. This is contained in a MS on the back of which is said to be observable the name of William—afterward altered to Thomas—Gough. (I could not, for my own part,

see the former name.) Chapman's name was substituted for that of Gough, and later (very much later) this in turn was scratched out to make way for Shakspere's. Thomas Goffe was nineteen in 1611 when the play was licensed, and so the strongest claim, on the external evidence, is Chapman's, especially as his name was evidently on the MS when Warburton credited the play to him. Shakspere's name had displaced Chapman's before Oldys' time, but late enough not to bother us. It has been suggested, however, that this play is to be identified with *The Tyrant*, which (according to *Biographia Dramatica*) was sold among Warburton's books in November, 1759. If so, Warburton must have been mistaken in declaring that that play was among the ones destroyed by his deplorable cook. It is in favor of this view that a tyrant is the principal figure in the play, and that he is known only as "The Tyrant." On the other hand *The Tyrant* was not only entered separately by Warburton, but was also entered by Moseley in the Stationers' Register in 1660 as Massinger's, while this play (called by him *Maid's Tragedy, 2nd Part*, as if it were a continuation of Beaumont and Fletcher's play) was entered in 1653 without any author's name. Though Fleay is opposed to the idea of Middleton's authorship, I believe this *Second Maiden's Tragedy* to be the work of that dramatist, though there may also be a second writer (perhaps the author of *The Revenger's Tragedy*). The play is worthy of a minute examination; and so, among the other plays of this section, are *Alphonsus of Germany, Merry Devil, Pericles, Fortune, Country Girl*, and *Revenge for Honor*.

V

Next to be considered are plays with ascriptions not quite negligible, but unworthy of acceptance in the absence of confirmation. Some of these concern Shakspere. To him (absurdly enough) is given by Archer the first part of *Jeronimo*, the authorship of which play is to seek, for there are strong reasons against the assumption that it was by Kyd, who wrote *The Spanish Tragedy* (which also Archer credits to Shakspere). Not only does *Jeronimo* contradict the *Tragedy*, but the run of the verse is totally unlike Kyd's. *Locrine*, published in 1595 as corrected by W. S. (most likely Shakspere, though possibly Sly), was not included in the first folio, but found its

way into the third folio, and subsequently was credited to Shakspere in Kirkman's second list (in his first, he had given it to "W. S."). This play has received much attention; and excellent reasons have been shown for giving it to first one and then another of the fathers of our drama, but it remains still unattached, the most convincing argument being Mr. Gaud's on behalf of Peele; but the fact must not be overlooked that it contains two hints of Shakspere: Hector is slain by the Myrmidons, as in *Troilus;* and Brutus, *alias* Posthumius, is the husband of Innogen, as in *Cymbeline.* It has been plausibly suggested that Shakspere edited the play for the dying Peele, its author; but I think that in that case Peele's name would have appeared on the title-page. In all probability it was a composite work. *Mucedorus* (to be spoken of later), *Fair Em,* and *The Merry Devil* (already dealt with) were all bound together in Charles II's library in a volume labeled with Shakspere's name; but this is *Fair Em*'s only claim to be considered the work of the great dramatist. *Bloody Banquet* was published in 1620 as by "T. D.," and modern editors are inclined to interpret these initials as standing for Drue. Why not for Dekker? Archer gives it to "Thos Barker"; and, as in the same list Dekker's *Match Me in London* and *Fortunatus* are both credited to "Thomas Barker," while elsewhere "Darker" is used, it is evident that "Barker" is merely a misreading of "Dekker." That writer is, anyhow, the only dramatist to whom external evidence, however slight, attributes the play. Similarly *The Careless Shepherdess,* published in 1656 as by "T. G.," is ascribed by Kirkman to Goffe. Of this class the ones claiming attention are *Em, Locrine,* and *Jeronimo.* Some may suppose that *The Queen,* previously mentioned, should have been included in this class by reason of Archer's apparent ascription of it to Fletcher; but this is probably only a blunder, due mainly to the use of the word "Queen" as a heading. Three successive entries are *Queen, Queen of Corinth,* and *Queen of Her Sex,* and only the first-named is given an author. As the subtitle of *The Queen* is "The Excellency of Her Sex," the problem of Archer's meaning is apparently solved. The entries should run:

Queen		
"	of Corinth	Fletcher
"	of Her Sex	——

425

It may be, however, that the ascription of *The Queen* to Fletcher results from the mention of Fletcher's name in the commendatory verse by "R. C."

VI

The next class consists of a couple of plays of alleged joint authorship, the attribution of each being in part probable and in part of very little value. These are *Two Noble Kinsmen* and *Birth of Merlin*. And here it may be as well to point out that there are at least three, perhaps as many as five, dramatists whose names were of such weight as to induce unscrupulous publishers to use them fraudulently long after the writers themselves had passed away. Beaumont's name was of value in after-years only when joined with Fletcher's, and Marlowe's only for a part of the time; but the names of Shakspere and Jonson and Fletcher made a constant appeal. Hence the attribution of *Birth of Merlin* to Shakspere and Rowley forty-six years after the death of the former and probably about a quarter of a century after the latter had ceased to write may be held to be very weak evidence in favor of Shakspere but to constitute a strong probability in the case of Rowley, not because the one lived much nearer to Kirkman's own times than the other, but because in 1662 Rowley's name was of no weight, while Shakspere's was, and because, therefore, we cannot imagine Rowley's being attached to the play otherwise than in good faith, while Shakspere's may have been used with intention to defraud. In all cases of publications dating subsequent to the outbreak of the Revolution we may assume that the names of the lesser-known dramatists were cited because they were found on the MSS from which the quartos were published, because the publishers remembered the authorship, or because someone vouched for it. One cannot take these ascriptions as conclusive only because one does not know what was the evidence by which the publishers were guided. In the case of *The Birth of Merlin*, if that play date from the middle nineties, as seems probable, it is likely that in its original form it was not Rowley's. The connection of this play with Middleton's *Mayor of Quinborough* is not to be overlooked.

The other play (which, like *The Birth of Merlin*, will well repay study) was entered in the Stationers' Register and published in 1634

as by Fletcher and Shakspere, named in publishers' advertisements of 1653, 1654, and 1661 as by Beaumont and Fletcher, and published in the 1679 folio of the works of those dramatists, but is also found bound with eleven undoubted Shaksperean plays. Though the attribution to the greatest of dramatists is not worth much, it is not necessarily wrong; but the evidence in favor of Fletcher is certainly the stronger of the two. The mere fact of its being listed as Beaumont and Fletcher's after being published as Fletcher and Shakspere's gives an air of probability to the ascription to Fletcher and casts a doubt on the correctness of the use of Shakspere's name.

VII

The next class is a long one, for it consists of those plays in regard to which the evidence must be regarded as probably correct but still lacking certainty. Among these are plays which were published anonymously, but to which one or more of the cataloguers have attached the names of various authors for no reason that may be guessed except information from supposedly reliable sources or the authority of old MS attributions. There is no reason why in some cases this evidence should be considered ample and in others be disregarded: in reality they are all on the one footing, and must each stand or fall by the internal evidence.

Kirkman gives *Blurt* and *Phœnix* to Middleton, and the two parts of *Edward IV* and *Fair Maid of the Exchange* to Heywood; while he and Archer both give *The Family of Love* and *Michaelmas Term* to Middleton, *Revenger's Tragedy* to Tourneur, and *Mucedorus* to Shakspere. Of these attributions the only ones rejected by the critics are those of *Mucedorus* and *Fair Maid of the Exchange*, but to me the quiet acceptance of Tourneur's authorship of *The Revenger's Tragedy* is strange.

This play differs so entirely from *The Atheist's Tragedy*, which is unquestionably Tourneur's (and on the internal evidence can be given to no one else), that I cannot conceive of the two as being by the one author. To accept Tourneur as the writer of *The Revenger's Tragedy* we have to suppose that he alone of the Elizabethan dramatists did not develop but absolutely revolutionized his manner of writing. That the author of this tragedy was not a one-play drama-

tist may be inferred by his mastery of his medium, but I know of no one among the named writers of the time to whom I would attribute it, unless it be Middleton, to whose verse alone the swing of the verse of *The Revenger's Tragedy* makes some approximation. The student may compare it with *Women, Beware Women*, which internal evidence shows to be wholly Middleton's, and which exhibits his style in tragedy. I prefer, however, to consider *The Revenger's Tragedy* as the greatest work of its period of that prolific writer "Anon," and look upon the establishment of the identity of the author as one of the chief problems to be tackled by students of Elizabethan drama.

The authorship of *Edward IV* is an interesting question. Heywood's claim is anything but strong; but the claim of Shakspere, to whom R. and L. give it, is weaker still, inasmuch as the play was performed by Lord Derby's Company. If Mr. Greg be right in supposing *Henry Richmond*, Part 2, for which Robert Wilson, Jr., was paid £8 in November, 1599, to have been a sequel, it is likely that Wilson was author or part author of *Edward IV;* but the ground for Mr. Greg's supposition is not very firm.

Mucedorus, according to Malone, was by Greene, but Fleay favors Lodge's authorship because "Musedor" equals "Muse of Gold," and "Golde" was Lodge's anagrammatized pen-name. As for *The Fair Maid of the Exchange*, its ascription to Heywood was doubted by Langbaine "since his name is not prefixt, neither does the style or œconomy resemble the rest of his labors." Mr. Fleay thinks it Machin's.

To the same class belong five plays published under authors' initials, the full names being supplied rightly or wrongly by the catalogue-compilers. Two of these are *A Trick* and *A Mad World*, both published as by "T. M." and given by Kirkman to Middleton. As both these comedies were acted by Paul's children the ascription is probably correct. Archer anticipated Kirkman in the attribution of *A Mad World*, but the other play he credited to Shakspere, though a study of it shows Kirkman to be right. The "G. C." of *Humorous Day's Mirth*, the "W. R." of *Match at Midnight*, and the "W. S." of *Cromwell* are interpreted by both Archer and Kirkman as indicating Chapman, Rowley, and Shakspere respectively, and

in each case the name of the acting company adds reason to the attribution. *Cromwell* found its way into the third Shakspere folio; but, though it was acted by the Lord Chamberlain's men, its "W. S." need not have been Shakspere. Printed in 1613, it was acted before 1603. Wentworth Smith is not known to have been connected with the Lord Chamberlain's company; and Sly, who belonged to it, is not known to have engaged in dramatic composition. We need scarcely doubt that the initials were meant, whether fraudulently or honestly, for Shakspere. Perhaps, though written by some hack, *Cromwell* was produced under his name. Like this play, *Match at Midnight* is worth examination. It is certainly an alteration; and it has been surmised that the original author was Middleton. It is probably the play licensed as *Match or no Match* for the Fortune in 1624 as by "Mr. Rowley," but in its first form it was much earlier. *Humorous Day's Mirth* may be believed to be Chapman's, because his hand may be traced and the comedy contains nothing not possibly his. The attribution to him is the more readily acceptable after a study of *The Blind Beggar* and *Gentleman Usher*, of which the former is obviously by one writer, whom the style here and there shows to be Chapman, wretched as the verse is for him, while the latter, a twice-written play, shows the contrast between the early Chapman, as seen here, and the late Chapman, as seen in *M. d'Olive* (also entirely his).

As regards all five of the plays just dealt with, the value of the attributions by the cataloguers is not easy to gauge: they may be blunders, they may be the outcome of actual knowledge or of more or less reliable information, or they may be the result of a guess-work interpretation of the initials under which the plays were published; but in any case there is no reason to call in question their good faith. In three of the five cases the attributions are accepted by the critics, and in a fourth it is accepted in part.

Others of this class are plays published after the closing of the theaters and then attributed to some or other of the lesser men no longer living—meaning by "lesser" here, as elsewhere, not those of less merit, but those of less fame. These are *Old Law* (rightly ascribed to Massinger, Middleton, and Rowley), *Thracian Wonder*, *Virgin Widow*, *Witch of Edmonton*, *Thierry and Theodoret* (published in 1648 as by Fletcher, and the next year as by Beaumont and Fletcher,

and ascribed by Archer to the two poets, jointly), *Lust's Dominion* (printed in 1657 as by Marlowe, but containing matter based on a pamphlet issued after his death, and probably identical in its present form with the *Spanish Moor's Tragedy* of Dekker, Haughton, and Day, though the acceptance of the theory of their authorship does not necessarily exclude the idea of the original authorship of Marlowe), *Anything for a Quiet Life*, *Appius and Virginia* (the contrast between the classical restraint of this play and the fiery romance of Webster's undoubted work making it especially worthy of close study), *Cure for a Cuckold*, *Mayor of Quinborough* (printed in 1661 as by Middleton, but containing a passage that cannot possibly be Middleton's, and must have been written after the closing of the theaters), *More Dissemblers* and *No Wit* (both of which are clearly rightly attributed to Middleton), and *Old Couple*. *Cure for a Cuckold* was published in 1661 as by Webster and Rowley, and the statement in the publishers' address that "many persons remember the acting" adds to the probability of the good faith of the ascription. Webster's touch is not very obvious in this play, and I do not feel absolutely certain of his being concerned in it. At first I thought I saw Massinger's hand with Rowley's in the two scenes of Act I and was much inclined to see Middleton instead of Rowley in III, 1, and the part of IV, 2 preceding Bonvile's entry, and in part of I, 2. I mention this because Mr. Fleay at first gave Act I to Massinger and the rest of the play to Rowley, and afterward substituted Middleton for Massinger. On further examination, however, I came to the conclusion that neither Massinger nor Middleton was concerned in the play, and that Webster must be accepted as part author. Rochfort's story and the story of Compass are wholly Rowley's, while the Clare part is Rowley's, rewritten by Webster: at least, that is my view. *The Mayor of Quinborough* is vouched for in its preface as "the first flight" of the author, and this might make the correctness of the attribution to Middleton more probable were it identifiable with the *Vortiger* first produced by the Admiral's men in 1596. In an extant MS, however, it is called *Hengist*, which was the name of an old play revised by the Admiral's men in 1597. If this be it, Middleton can be no more than a reviser, and an older writer's work may be looked for.

In the same category come a few dramas published prior to the closing of the theaters but subsequent to the decease of their reputed authors. These are *The Antiquary*, *Chaste Maid*, *Edward II* (which R. and L. give to Shakspere, but Kirkman to Marlowe—rightly, as is shown by a study of the play), *Faustus*, *Martyr'd Soldier*, and *A Shoemaker a Gentleman* (published as by "W. R.," shown by the Stationers' Register entry to be Rowley). The two quartos of *Faustus* offer an interesting problem. The 1604 edition was entered in the Stationers' Register in January 1600–1, and so is not likely to contain the additions made by Bird and Samuel Rowley in 1602. It does, however, contain matter that must date from a time subsequent to Marlowe's decease—matter omitted, by the way, from the edition of 1616, which contains lines imitated in *The Taming of a Shrew* (printed 1594). In the later edition there is, however, other matter dating later than Marlowe. Originally the play was by a single author, as shown by the "Auctor" at the end. I believe that in the earlier quarto all the serious parts are Marlowe's, and the rest partly Marlowe's and partly the work of a reviser, and that in the later quarto there is also a third hand observable. An intelligent endeavor to distinguish between the genuine and the spurious portions of the play—a task not accomplished by merely subtracting the clowning portions, some of which are probably Marlowe's own—would be very welcome.

There are a few other plays in the same class. *Faithful Friends* was entered in the Stationers' Register in 1660 as by Beaumont and Fletcher, and the MS also bears their names. The fact that it was not included in the second folio of their works does not necessarily mean anything. Nor does the exclusion of *London Prodigal* and *Yorkshire Tragedy* from the first Shakspere folio really imply that those plays are not Shakspere's. The latter, which is attributed to him in the Stationers' Register, is, as has been shown by Mr. Fleay and Mr. Dobell, strangely connected with Wilkins' *Miseries of Enforced Marriage*, and Mr. Dobell makes out a good case for that dramatist's authorship, while both regard it as constituting the original tragic ending of *The Miseries*, which was originally a tragedy, as is shown by the Stationers' Register entry of July, 1607, where it is so described. There are, however, difficulties in the way of the

acceptance of these ideas, such as the fact that the 1608 quarto of *Yorkshire Tragedy* describes it as "All's One or One of the Four Plays in one called a Yorkshire Tragedy." *The Miseries* certainly deals with Calverley's life and needs the *Tragedy* for its completion, though in the latter the characters are without names, while in the former they have false names. But on the other hand it is to be noted that in scene 2 of the *Tragedy* the husband speaks of having chosen a wife (whereas according to *The Miseries* she was forced on him), that his guardian is still alive, and that in scene 1 the husband has been married long enough to have two or three children before Clare (if the young mistress spoken of be indeed she) hears of it, and that this scene has no connection with the story of Calverley's wife that forms the plot of the play. As for *London Prodigal*, Mr. Fleay showed the most excellent reasons for believing it to be a satirical sketch dealing with an incident in the career of Greene, only to (apparently) abandon the idea when he found the play to be of later date.

The two parts of *The Troublesome Reign* were issued during Shakspere's lifetime as by "W. Sh." and in 1622 with his name in full, but found their way into no Shakspere folio, probably because the collection already contained a *King John*. The quartos' ascriptions may have been due to fraud or (though less probably) to confusion with Shakspere's play. That he used these two plays is undeniable: that they are to the slightest extent his is highly improbable.

Sir Clyomon, which may date from before our period, has a MS ascription to Peele of which the genuineness may be questioned. If this be a modern forgery, the place of the play should be among the strictly anonymous, if it be included at all.

Andromana, which was published in 1660 as by "J. S." and was attributed in a prologue at a revival to Shirley, need not detain us; nor does *Club Law*, of which Hawkins (who presumably had some authority for his statement) in 1741 declared Ruggle to have been the author, make any great demands upon our consideration. *The Inconstant Lady*, entered in the Stationers' Register in September, 1653, as by Arthur Wilson, is also of no great importance; but the authorship of *Nero* is a matter of moment. It is attributed to Massinger in an old hand and is said to be found bound with his

plays. It however shows no trace of that writer. It was transferred from one publisher to another with two of May's works, but its style shows no resemblance to that of May.

George-a-Greene is another play worthy of attention. It is almost invariably treated as Greene's because of a MS note to which the very gravest suspicion ought to attach. I feel so certain that this note is a modern forgery that I would treat the play among those to whom no one's name is attached by the external evidence but for one circumstance—its place in the Cockpit list. In this list the plays are grouped according to authors, and *George-a-Greene* appears between Forde's plays and Heywood's. It is out of the question that it can be Forde's, and as it dates from prior to December, 1593, it would be very early for Heywood; but it was not printed till 1599, and as it stands may be a recasting by Heywood of the work of an earlier writer. Perhaps, however, Heywood's revision may have been much later in date, not applying at all to the extant version. It may be as well to add that it is unlikely that the play is put in this position in the Cockpit list as the single work of another author, because the "singletons" stand alone at the end of the list.

Another play, *Case is Altered*, is in this group for another reason. It did not appear among Jonson's collected works, and when it was published in 1609 his name appeared on some copies only. It may have been added to the later copies because the authorship had been ascertained, or it may have been removed after appearing in the earlier ones, because it had been found to be incorrect, because Jonson objected, or for some other reason. The case is essentially one for internal evidence; and this has made the critics unanimously accept the comedy as Jonson's. Was it entirely his? Concerning *Arcadia* there is a slight doubt, because, though published in 1640 as by Shirley, it does not appear in the list of his published plays which Shirley issued in 1652, while *Ajax*, published anonymously in 1640 and as Shirley's in 1659, was also omitted. Probably the omission of each is due to an oversight. *Look about You* was published anonymously in 1600–1, but the promise made at the close of the play by one of the characters, the Earl of Gloster, to fire the Saracens out of Portugal connects it with Wadeson, who wrote for

the Admiral's (the company which produced *Look about You*) a play called *The Humorous Earl of Gloster and His Conquest of Portingal*, acted in 1601, whence it may be inferred that Wadeson was in part at least the author of this work also.

It is doubtful whether *The Twins* should belong to this group or to the class to be dealt with later in which are comprised plays of attributions presumably complete. That depends upon the time when its author flourished. It need not detain us. The two *Tamburlaine* plays are always given to Marlowe, but the evidence for the ascription is not of the strongest. The printer's address to the 1592 edition states that both are the work of one writer, but it does not give his name. Harvey in 1593 calls Marlowe "Tamburlaine," but that does not necessarily mean that Marlowe wrote the plays. It is just as reasonable to regard the statement of 1604 regarding Nashe, that the spiders "went stealing over his head as if they had been conning of Tamburlaine," as proof of Nashe's authorship. Langbaine says, "Had I not Mr. Heywood's word for it I should not believe this play to be Marlowe's." Presumably he is referring to Heywood's prologue to Marlowe's *Jew of Malta*, which he misread. Kirkman, after leaving the authorship blank in his earlier list, filled in Marlowe's name in the later, the presumption being that he had in the meantime obtained information in regard to it which he considered reliable; but that was about three-quarters of a century after Marlowe's death.

In a MS volume labeled "Geo. Wilde's Plays: Miscell. Poems" is found *The Converted Robber*. The other contents are *Love's Hospital* (with an ascription to George Wilde), a Latin play by the same writer, and a number of poems by various authors. It is probably by Wilde, and may be in the handwriting of the author.

There is one other play to be spoken of in this class, the extraordinary *Two Tragedies*. This play contains two separate stories most loosely woven together, if they can be said to be woven together at all. The subject of the one is Merry's murder of Beech; the other's is that of the old nursery tale of *The Babes in the Wood*. In the latter part of 1599 Haughton and Day handed over to Henslowe for the Admiral's men a "Tragedy of Merry" (licensed January 1599–1600). About the same time Chettle received 10*s*. from

Henslowe on behalf of the same company in earnest of an "Orphan's Tragedy," while in January 1599–1600 Day was paid £2 in advance on an "Italian Tragedy of ——," which Mr. Greg identifies with this "Orphan's Tragedy," on which apparently Chettle was still at work in September, 1601. In that year was published "Two Lamentable Tragedies. The one of the murther of Master Beech done by Thomas Merry. The other of a Young Childe murthered in a wood by Two Ruffins, with the consent of his Unckle. By Rob. Yarington." Who was Rob. Yarington? With the exception of Mr. Fleay, who looked upon the name as an assumed one, the critics have all treated him as a single-play writer; but quite recently Mr. Greg has seen reason to regard him as the mere transcriber of the play, who put his name at the end of the MS, whence it found its way to the title-page of the quarto. For myself, I have long been of opinion that the name is a misreading of Wm. Haugton (that is to say, Haughton).

Of the numerous plays of this class the student may be particularly recommended to study the two *Tamburlaine* plays, the two *John* plays, *Edward II*, *Faustus*, *Lust's Dominion*, *George-a-Greene*, *Case Is Altered*, *Yorkshire Tragedy*, the two parts of *Edward IV*, *Look about You*, *Match at Midnight*, *London Prodigal*, *Cromwell*, *Mucedorus*, *Two Tragedies*, *Faithful Friends*, *Thierry*, *Fair Maid of the Exchange*, *Revenger's Tragedy*, *Nero*, *Appius*, *Cure for a Cuckold*, and *Thracian Wonder*.

VIII

Closely connected with both the fatherless plays already dealt with and those of doubtful parentage just considered are those whose begetters' names are masked under initials not connected by sixteenth- or seventeenth-century evidence with the names of any particular dramatists, initials which may or may not be correctly given and which in any case may not indicate full authorship. Such are *Old Wives' Tale*, by G. P., always attributed to Peele and in all probability his, though the initials are also those of Puttenham (who, however, had been dead five years when the play was put into print); *Alphonsus of Aragon*, published in 1599 as by R. G., and always ascribed for this very inconclusive reason to Greene, who died in 1592; *The Three Ladies* and its amplification, *The Three Lords*,

whose "R. W." is supposed to be the elder Wilson, but may possibly be Wilmot; *Petronius Maximus*, by W. S., possibly Sampson, possibly, but very improbably, Wentworth (or William) Smith, most likely some unknown man; and *Valiant Scot*, which has Webster's initials, but may be by the publisher Waterson. I put *The Lanching of the May* here because I know not on what grounds it is attributed to Methold. Its "W. M.," might stand as well for Montague, though Methold, by reason of his connection with the East India Co., is the likelier. If there be good reason for the ascription to him, the play should rank in a much later category than this.

Of these plays *Alphonsus* and *Old Wives' Tale* are particularly worthy of study because of the probability of their authorship by two of the founders of our drama, but to assume Greene's responsibility for the former, as is generally done, is unwarranted. Kirkman gives it to "R. C." This might be thought to be a printer's error, were it not for the fact that Langbaine does the same thing. The question arises, has he followed Kirkman, or was there an "R. C." edition? If so, Greene's claim, not too strong in any case, becomes very weak. Personally I think it surprising that the ascription to him has remained unquestioned, because the differences between the style of this play and that of his undoubted dramatic work are very marked. *Friar Bacon*, for instance, I take on both the external and the internal evidence to be wholly his: if *Alphonsus* is to be regarded as by the same writer, he must be considered to have greatly developed subsequently to his writing of it, for it does not show even the germs of his future excellence.

There are three other plays in this section, all published by "R. D." in 1662 in one volume with commendatory verses by "Theatro-Philos," who congratulates "his worthy friend Mr. R. F. upon his publishing his ternary of English Plays." As this versifier not only credits these plays to R. F. (presumably a misprint for "R.D."), but also seems to say that they were never acted, while R.D. credits them to "three several wits," and one of them at least has clearly been on the stage, it may be that the plays had been revised before publication but never acted in their new shape. That one of the three (*Thorny Abbey*) has been rewritten is very evident. The only known dramatist of the period with initials R.D. who may have been living

as late as 1662 is Davenport. The identity of this publisher and possible editor is not, however, of great consequence.

Of these three plays, one (*Grim*) is printed as by I. T., another (*Thorny Abbey*) as by T. W., and the third (*The Marriage-Broker*) as by M. W. This last-named writer, who is described on the title-page as an M.A., may have been Martin Westcomb (M.A., of Oxford, 1638) or Michael Wigmore (M.A., of Oxford, 1611), who both wrote, though they are not known to have written for the stage. *Thorny Abbey* may be by Thomas Weaver (who in 1654 published *Songs and Poems of Love and Drollery*), Thomas Wharton (a writer of verses, born 1614, *ob.* 1673), Sir Thomas Wroth (who published in 1620 a translation from Virgil and was also the author of a century of epigrams), Thomas Washbourne (who wrote "divine" poems), or Thomas (Viscount) Wenman (who had Barnabe Barnes as a servant and wrote commendatory verses for Browne's *Britannia's Pastorals*). If it be more reasonable to search for the author among those known to have written for the stage, there are to be considered Anthony (that is to say, Tony) Wadeson and Thomas Watson, and the initials fit the latter better than the former. The play shows clearly one writer of early and one of late date, the revision being very thorough. The prelude (with its Fool and its mention of pre-Elizabethan fools) is early, and so is the epilogue, while the prologue is quite late in style. The play proper tells two distinct stories, the first being mentioned in scenes 2 and 6, but being practically wholly contained in scenes 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, and 11, while the other scenes are given up to the second story. In the latter, after scene 11, we have a chorus, with a dumb show of the succeeding events. This must be a relic of the old play; but it is the other plot which shows most archaism in its language. "For to" is frequent; and note also such antiquated tags as "Here by the uncouth cavern of a wall" (scene 3), "ere his eyes Had closed their fleshy windows of their light" (scene 4), "his clamorous cries" (scene 4), "And gone to wander in eternal night, And ransack some Cimmerian fearéd cave" (scene 9), "let's invocate the powers above For to reveal the horrid murderers" (scene 9), "Waste these life-seeing tapers of mine eyes Till they drop forth the sockets of my skull But I will find the execrable slave," (scene 11) and "hideous, fearful cries" (scene 11). All this reeks of the age

and manner of Kyd. The second story (that of Thorny) has much less of the older writer or writers left, and phrases such as "Words able to infuse an appetite In a cool votarist" smack of Massinger and a period forty or fifty years later than Kyd or Watson. *The Revenger's Tragedy* is palpably imitated, in Thorny's speech on the skull which he holds in his hand:

> What swearer sees this mouth and does not tremble?
> Oh, man! how vain art thou that speakest thy labors
> For the bewitching minute of this world,
> And after all thy joys to hell be hurled,

and again in the line in a later scene, where the skull in introduced once more, "This face will not deceive me." (The character of the verse precludes the supposition that these passages were in the early play, and that the author of *The Revenger's Tragedy* saw the possibilities in them and boldly borrowed the ideas and transformed them into some of the most passionate lines in the language.) It may be urged that the other part of the play is later than *Macbeth* inasmuch as that play is palpably imitated, but the imitation may not have been in the original version or may have followed some much earlier version of *Macbeth* than that which is extant.

It is not my object in this paper to put forward views of my own based on considerations of style. If in this case I have to some extent diverged from the path I have set myself, the interest of the subject must be my excuse. *Thorny Abbey* is not a great play—far from it; but the apparent fact of its earliness of date in its original form and the circumstance that the initials of its reputed author are those of Thomas Watson make it well worthy of study, inasmuch as not one of his dramatic productions is known to be extant, and this is, so far as I am aware, the first suggestion yet made that he may be partly responsible for any one of the hundreds of plays of the period which we possess. To judge by this, the loss may not be great; but to judge any writer so would not be just. In fact, Watson's fame as a dramatist was high. He died in 1592. Six years later he was mentioned by Meres as among the best for tragedy (one of the two stories told in *Thorny Abbey*—the one in which the older writer's presence is most obvious—is a tragedy); but a more marked tribute to his merit or his repute is Heywood's mention of

him in his "Hierarchie of Angels" published in 1634 (forty-two years after Watson's death), where he is mentioned (between Kyd and Nashe) with the following poet-dramatists: Greene, Peele, Kyd, Nashe, Beaumont, Shakspere, Jonson, Fletcher, Webster, Dekker, May, Middleton, Forde. As Heywood was merely showing how the most famous writers had their Christian names familiarly shortened, the omission of the names of Tourneur and Chapman and Peele need excite no remark, for "George" and "Cyril" do not lend themselves to abbreviation; but Heywood seems thus to esteem Watson (and also Nashe—of whose dramatic ability we can form no proper judgment—and May) above Massinger, Marlowe, Shirley, Lyly, Rowley, Day, and Field. The poem says:

> He wrote
> Able to make Apollo's self to dote
> Upon his muse.

He was a friend of Lyly and Peele and Kyd, and the last-named did not scruple to lift into his *Spanish Tragedy* an extract from Watson's *Hekatompathia*, slightly altered. After his death, William Cornwallis in his charge against him said he "could devise twenty fictions and knaveries in a play, which was his daily practice and his living." Anyone who wants a quite new field of Elizabethan study might first steep himself in a knowledge of Watson's poetry and then read the dramas (and especially the unattached dramas) of the period prior to the middle of 1592, with an eye to determining his presence. That he had something to do with some of the anonymous plays of that time or with some of Kyd's plays or some of Peele's is not at all unlikely.

While on this subject it may be urged that the value of Heywood's testimony to the greatness of Nashe as well as of Watson can only be judged by the discovery that some anonymous play of the period is wholly or mainly his work; and this too is a task that should commend itself to some of our students; though, as they could lay their foundation for a knowledge of Watson's style only on his poems, so they could for an understanding of Nashe's rely only on his prose tracts, his quasi-dramatic *Summer's Will*, and so much of *Dido* as may be his (in my opinion, I, 2, from Aeneas' entry; I, 3; [?] IV, 1; and IV, 2; the rest being Marlowe's with the exception of II, and

perhaps III, 3, which are joint, while V, 2 may also contain a little of Nashe's work; so that, if my view be correct, there is not very much of Nashe to judge by). As for *Thorny Abbey*, it may be on the whole more probable that the initials on the title-page are those not of the original author, but of the reviser (in which case of course they would not belong to Watson); and the likelihood would be increased if it could be definitely ascertained that the initials given with the other two plays of the "ternary" were those of revisers.

The I. T. (probably meaning J. T.) of the third play of the "ternary" may be Tatham, but if so "J. T." must be the initials not of the original author, but of a reviser, for the play dates back to the time of Elizabeth, when, as internal evidence shows, it was called *The Devil and His Dame*. Fleay ascribes it to Haughton, because Haughton was paid 5*s*. "in earnest of a book which he would call" by that name for the Admiral's men in 1600; but, as the entry was afterwards canceled, it would seem that the money was refunded. It is possible therefore that the play was never written; or it may have been written and sold to some other company.

Concerning *Old Wives' Tale*, Peele's claim to which must rest almost entirely on the internal evidence, though it is always treated as indubitably his, I have said that it is against Puttenham's claim that he was dead when it was published under his initials. This may be thought inconsistent with my suggestion of Watson in similar circumstances as the original author of *Thorny Abbey*. In reality there is no inconsistency. In the latter case, if R. D. published a play with the initials of an author who had been dead 70 years, it was presumably because he found the initials on the MS and did not know to whom they belonged. In the other case, it should not have been difficult for the publisher to ascertain the authorship of the play, which had been acted not very many years before, and, as Puttenham was dead, there would be no hesitation about printing his name in full. When only initials are given it will usually be found that a play was published by the author or with his sanction, or else that the publisher did not know to whom the initials belonged. If this play could be shown to have been published without Peele's authority I should say that the chances were against its being his; as it is, there is no one else with any serious claim to its authorship.

IX

The next class comprises plays of which the authors' initials are definitely known, the versions extant being authorized and therefore to be regarded as complete, though the authors' names have absolutely to be guessed at. Of these, the "A. M." of *Two Italian Gentlemen*, which, Langbaine tells us, is in old catalogues ascribed to Thomas Barker, is doubtless Mundy; the "J. D." of *Knave in Grain* may perhaps stand for Day (Denham being unlikely); and the "S. S." of *Honest Lawyer*, which was published in 1616, was perhaps Samuel Sheppard, who ten years previously had been Jonson's amanuensis. The "J. C." of *The Two Merry Milkmaids* may stand either for Joshua (or John) Cooke or for John Cumber, for whom Mr. Fleay claims it. The printer's address implies that the play was given to the press by the author. The address to the reader of *The Valiant Welshman* is clearly by the author, "R. A.," who may have been, but more probably was not, Robert Armin. The "J. S." of *Phillis* may represent Shirley. If not, the play, as a mere translation, should not find a place here. The "E. S." of *Cupid's Whirligig* is generally interpreted as indicating Sharpham, though Oldys says the play "has been ascribed to Shakspere." If so, the Shakspere must have been Edmund. As, however, Sharpham's *Fleire*, given to the press the year before, was also acted by the Revels' children, the ascription to him is probably correct. In *Scourge for Simony* (generally known as "the second part of *The Return from Parnassus*, though it is not called the second part in the quarto) there is interpolated matter that may not be the author's, though one copy has a dedication by J. D., which serves to show that the edition was an authorized one, especially as the same initials are on the Lansdowne MS. The other two *Parnassus* plays are spoken of in the final play as being by the same author and their MSS may be taken as genuine. The authorship of this trilogy affords a capital subject of investigation; and so too does *Two Italian Gentlemen*, as being one of the earliest dramas of the period (albeit probably not an acting drama). This play has, however, mysteriously disappeared, and I treat it as extant only because of the unlikelihood of its having been destroyed.

X

The next group consists mainly of so-called "Beaumont and Fletcher" plays. Here we have plays in each of which we have a definite choice of authors, one of whom was certainly concerned, though on the evidence it cannot be said definitely which one. In the case of most of the "Beaumont and Fletcher" plays of this class both authors may have participated, and in none of them is there any certainty of the ascription being complete. Though so much attention has been paid to the works of the "twin stars" of our drama there is yet plenty of scope for others. Mr. Fleay was the pioneer in this field; and it is safe to say that had he not shown the way none of his successors (of whom I have been one) would have trodden that path. He remains the most original and the most imaginative, but not the most reliable, of investigators in this field. The first of his followers was Mr. Boyle, whose intolerance of all views running counter to his own must not blind us to the excellence of much of his work. That he is never mistaken is, after all, his misfortune; and even the childish animosity with which he so perseveringly assails those who venture to disagree with him may be charitably set down to the phenomenal degree of importance which he attaches to all technical matters in which he happens to be interested. Such seriousness of aim would be most admirable if it did not run to rancor. Of my own work I need not speak; and of later laborers in this field the most noteworthy is Professor Thorndike, whose chronological conclusions approximate tolerably closely to mine, though these were deemed absurdly revolutionary when I put them forward some twenty years ago.

Of the thirteen Beaumont and Fletcher plays that have to be considered here *The Captain* and *Coxcomb* are Fletcher's according to Archer and Hills, Beaumont's according to R. and L.; the authorship of *Four Plays in One* is Fletcher's according to Archer, and Beaumont and Fletcher's according to R. and L.; *Nice Valor* and *Women Pleased* are joint works if Archer may be believed; regarding *Honest Man's Fortune* there is no evidence save Kirkman's and Gardiner's, both of whom give it to Fletcher; Archer, Lovelace, and R. and L. all give *Valentinian* to Fletcher; and as for *Wit without*

Money, it was published in 1639 as a joint work and is so treated by both Archer and R. and L.; while both of these give *Bonduca* to Fletcher. So far as the dates of these can be ascertained, Beaumont is available for every one of them. Concerning the authorship of *Valentinian*, *Women Pleased*, and *Wit without Money* there is virtual agreement; but as to the other half-dozen, all of which are worthy of the student's attention, there is a great variety of opinion. In regard to *Honest Man's Fortune*, by the way, I came to the opinion soon after the appearance of my Beaumont and Fletcher paper that Tourneur was my "unknown author." In 1613 no one else was writing in that style, and if I was at first kept from recognizing his presence it was because of the attribution to him of the altogether different *Revenger's Tragedy*. It will be noticed that Tourneur has here dropped rhyme, which he elsewhere used sparingly, and does not end his speeches with his lines, as he usually does in *The Atheist's Tragedy*. [Since the above was written it has been definitely ascertained that *Bonduca* and *Valentinian* date from not later than 1614, so that in dating them 1612 in my Beaumont and Fletcher paper of some twenty years ago instead of the ordinarily accepted 1616 or 1617 I was clearly on the right track, as also in regard to the possibility of Beaumont being concerned in the authorship of *Bonduca*.]

The four other plays now to be mentioned also call for study. *The Woman-Hater* was published in 1648 as by Fletcher (and the next year as by Beaumont and Fletcher), is stated in the prologue to be the work of a single writer, is given by Davenant to Fletcher, and bears that author's name written on a copy of the anonymous edition of 1607, with Beaumont's name substituted for it later. The external evidence thus declares the comedy to be the product of either Beaumont or Fletcher, but not of both. *Beggars' Bush* is given by Archer and Hills to Fletcher, and by R. and L. to Beaumont, and was in 1661 published in their joint names. It probably dates from a time when it was quite possible for Beaumont to be concerned in its production. *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* is given by Archer to Fletcher, but was published in 1635 as by Beaumont and Fletcher. The quarto contains contradictory assertions as to its being by one writer and by more than one. *Love's Cure* raises a very interesting question as to both date and authorship. Ascribed by Archer, and

also by a revival prologue, to Beaumont and Fletcher, it is declared in the epilogue to be the work of a single writer. As to the date, Fleay and Dr. Thorndike have shown excellent reason for attributing it to 1608 or earlier, and I myself surmised a similar period for its first production. All this reasoning and surmise would, however, appear to be heavily discounted by the fact that the play has since been found to be based on a Spanish drama licensed for publication in Valencia only some six months before Fletcher's demise. Accordingly the view has been put forward that neither Beaumont nor Fletcher had a hand in it; but if so, how has it found its way into the folio? And how is the prologue's definite attribution of it to both of them to be accounted for?

The absence of Fletcher may be conceded, the resemblances to his work being slight and unconvincing and the epilogue speaking of a single author; but despite the discovery of the late date of the Spanish play on which this is founded, I cannot abandon my view of Beaumont's participation. The allusion to the Prince of Orange as "Grave Maurice" (giving, as Professor Thorndike points out, a date of not later than 1618) and to the *Miraculous Maid* (1604) are both in portions of the play in which I saw the hand of Beaumont, and if III, 1 be not by Jonson it should be an imitation of him by Beaumont. Is it not possible that Massinger incorporated in his version of the Spanish play some scenes out of an early play by Beaumont? I do not know the Spanish play, or how much of the English comedy is derived from it, and so this suggestion may be utterly opposed to the facts of the case, but I shall be surprised to learn that the Spanish original shows any sign of the humors of Lazarillo (a distinctly Beaumontesque character) or more than a little of the contents of Act III. If it do, I shall not be ashamed to confess myself mistaken.

Not less a suitable subject for investigation is the comedy so absurdly known as *Green's Tu Quoque*, which was published in 1614 as by "Jo. Cooke." A later edition (1622) fills up the name as "John Cooke," and so Archer, Kirkman, and Langbaine, and so also the modern editors; but why should not the "Jo" of the first quarto have stood for "Joshua"? The name Joshua Cooke occurs in a MS note on the title-page of *How to Choose*, and the attribution

to Cooke of such a comparatively uncommon name as Joshua does not seem to me to be likely to be incorrect. It is of course possible that the two plays were by two different men of the name of Cooke, but they are of the one pattern, and with both Heywood had some unexplained connection.

As in this case we have to choose between Joshua and a possible John, so in *The Hector* we have to choose between Wentworth and a possible William Smith. This play was published in 1615 as by "W." Smith, which Langbaine interprets as William Smith, but which is perhaps as likely to have stood for Wentworth. So in *Game at Chess* we have a choice between the known Thomas and a possible Edward Middleton. An entry in the Privy Council Register of August 30, 1624, names the author as Edward Middleton; but a somewhat suspicious and certainly incorrect statement of facts in regard to the circumstances attending the production of the play speaks of Thomas Middleton as the author. There is every likelihood that the Council entry was a mistake.

XI

We have next to consider plays certainly of joint authorship, with the identity of one author certain and the identity of one doubtful. Of this class also a great majority are Fletcher plays. In *The Custom, Little French Lawyer,* and *False One* it is known that Fletcher had a hand, but also that he did not work alone; and, as these plays date from a time subsequent to Beaumont's death, it is reasonable to assume that his colleague was Massinger, who is known to have been concerned with him in the production of many of the plays of the "Beaumont and Fletcher" folio. *Wit at Several Weapons,* ascribed by Archer to Beaumont and Fletcher, is stated by a revival epilogue to have been only partly by Fletcher, and is worth study. *Lovers' Progress,* also given by Archer to the two friends, appears in the folio of 1647 and must be identical with Fletcher's *Wandering Lovers,* licensed December 6, 1623, for the King's men, by whom *Lovers' Progress* was acted. The prologue and epilogue declare it to be an alteration of Fletcher by another dramatist; and as, on September 9, 1653, Moseley entered in the Stationers' Register a *Wandering Lovers* by Massinger, it may be that that dramatist

was the reviser of Fletcher's play, though, as it had already appeared in the folio as altered by Massinger, it is hard to see why Moseley should enter it. It may be pointed out also that the sub-title of this play, according to Moseley, was "The Painter" and that no painter appears in *Lovers' Progress;* but it was Moseley's trick to get two plays entered for the one fee, *The Bashful Lover* and *Alexius, Very Woman* and *Woman's Plot, Believe as You List* and *The Judge* being separate plays so entered. The internal evidence, however, makes it quite clear that the alterer of Fletcher's play was Massinger. *Noble Gentleman* was licensed for the stage shortly after the death of Fletcher, but is credited by both Archer and R. and L. not only to him but also to Beaumont. The prologue tells us it is the work of more than one writer, and the interesting question arises whether the play was not a very early one found among Fletcher's papers after his death. For this reason it is worthy of attention. It is unfortunate that Malone does not tell us clearly whether or no Herbert names Fletcher as the author of this play, *The Prophetess, Sea Voyage, Spanish Curate, Wife for a Month, Rule a Wife,* and *Fair Maid of the Inn.*

Especially worthy of consideration is *The Spanish Tragedy,* which in its earlier form may be ranked among plays of which the authorship is known, the ascription being not merely correct but presumably complete, though I am by no means sure on grounds of style that some other (perhaps Watson, from whom there is some free borrowing) had not a hand in it; but in its later form it has to be dealt with here because the additions are uncertainly connected with the name of Jonson. Whether or no these additions are those known to have been made by him is a very interesting problem. The external evidence is strong in favor of the view that they are; and this view is supported by the fact that these additions are apparently parodied in the scene between Balurdo and the painter in Marston's *Antonio.* There are two other plays in this class—Randolph's *Hey for Honesty,* which was patched by an "F. J." who may or may not have been Jaques, and *Humor Out of Breath,* in which Day acknowledges a partner, who may possibly have been Chapman, to whom R. and L. attribute the comedy (though this is probably only by confusion of the title with that of *Humorous Day's Mirth*).

XII

There are several plays in which we are sure of one author, but in which the presence of another (named) author is a matter of doubt. Such is Shirley's *Constant Maid* (published in 1640 as by Shirley and in 1661 as by "T.B.," and in which consequently Thomas Brewer or Thomas Barker or some other may have had a hand). Such too is Daborne's *Poor Man's Comfort,* the "P. Massam" of which may have been either finisher or merely transcriber. The name resembles Massinger's, but the play offers no sign of the handiwork of that dramatist and seems to me pure Daborne. Others are *Wyat* (in which Heywood, Wentworth Smith, and Chettle may have been concerned as well as Dekker and Webster), Newcastle's two plays (in which the noble author may have received some assistance from Shirley, who is known to have helped him in his work of this nature), the two parts of Rutter's *Cid* (in both of which the two young Sackvilles perhaps took a hand, one of them certainly contributing something to the first part), *Blind Beggar of Bethnal Green* (published in 1659 as Day's, perhaps entirely revised by that writer, but more probably containing some of the work of Chettle, who originally wrote it with him in 1600), and Marlowe's *Jew of Malta,* which may have been patched by Heywood. *Parliament of Love* was licensed in 1624 as Massinger's, but was entered in the Stationers' Register in 1660 as Rowley's, an ascription followed by Warburton. One might by this judge the play to be partly Rowley's, but the evidence of style is conclusive as to Massinger's sole authorship. *Bashful Lover* was first published in 1655 as Massinger's, but some few copies attributed it instead to "B. J.," though the Stationers' Register entry had credited it to Massinger. There is no sign of Jonson's presence in the play. Heywood's *Royal King* has some of Wentworth Smith's work in it, if, as is doubtful, it be identical with the *Marshal Osric* acted in 1602. Though published as Heywood's and with his motto on the title-page, and therefore in all probability by his authority, the epistle to the reader declares it to be an old play, and it shows many signs of alteration. Whether Heywood in revising worked on an old drama of his own, or on the *Marshal Osric* he wrote in collaboration with Smith, or on a play

by some other dramatist, can only be determined by the internal evidence.

The Chances is certainly partly or wholly Fletcher's, but R. and L. give it to Beaumont, and Archer ascribes it to Shakspere. Its date makes Beaumont possible as a collaborator. *The Widow* was published in 1652 as by Jonson, Fletcher, and Middleton, the attribution being vouched for by Gough; but a MS note worthy of attention says it was by Middleton alone. Kirkman gives it to Middleton and Rowley. The first part of *The Honest Whore* was published in 1604 as by Dekker, but is shown by Henslowe's entry to have been partly by Middleton, unless we are to assume, as is improbable, that his work was thrown out and replaced by some of Dekker's before publication. *The Elder Brother* was published in 1651 as by Beaumont and Fletcher and ten years later as by Fletcher alone, to whom also the cataloguers give it. Hills also testifies to Fletcher's presence, which is certain; but, though the probable date of the play renders Beaumont's co-operation possible, there is no trace of him in it. With *Cupid's Revenge* it is otherwise. Published in 1615 as Fletcher's, this play was republished in 1630 as by Beaumont and Fletcher, to whom also R. and L. give it.

The remaining eight plays of this section are worthy of very careful examination, as are also the four just dealt with. *The Bloody Brother* was in 1639 entered in the Stationers' Register as by "J. B.," which may stand for "Jonson, Beaumont" or for some unknown writer. When published, it was ascribed to "B. J. F."—either the initials of an unknown writer or an indication of the authorship of Beaumont, Jonson, and Fletcher, (or "Beaumont, John Fletcher"). The next year it was reissued as Fletcher's, to whom it is attributed also by the cataloguers. His connection with the play is moreover rendered tolerably certain by the statement contained in Hills's verses. The question for consideration is the presence of Beaumont and Jonson. In my own view the latter wrote part of the play, and this view has been confirmed by the striking parallels adduced by my friend Mr. Charles Crawford in his *Collectanea;* but for Beaumont the probable date of the play is too late. *The Ball* and *Chabot* were both published in 1639 as by Chapman and Shirley but were entered in the Stationers' Register as by Shirley, who claims them as

his in his list of 1652, without any mention of indebtedness to Chapman (not perhaps a very vital point). *The Ball* was however licensed in 1632 as Shirley's without any mention of Chapman. R. and L. also attribute it to Shirley, while Archer, who gives *Chabot* to that poet, credits *The Ball* to Chapman. To judge by the internal evidence, *The Ball* is entirely Shirley's, while *Chabot* is mainly his, his revision of Chapman's work being very slight in Act I, material in II and III (though he has not touched III, 1 to the Queen's entry or the first half of III, 2), complete in IV, and very extensive in V. *The Traitor* has been claimed mainly for one Rivers, a Jesuit, and may possibly have been his on a first draft, but as it stands it shows no sign of containing the work of anyone but Shirley, who moreover definitely claims it in his dedication. *A Mad Couple* was published in 1653 as by Brome, and is given to him by all the list-makers; but, as it appears between Rowley's plays and Shirley's in the Cockpit list of 1639, it is probably founded on a play by the former. *Orlando* was sold by Greene, but may have been partly the work of Peele, inasmuch as the credit for passages from it is divided between him and Greene in "England's Parnassus." *The Noble Spanish Soldier*, entered as Dekker's in the Stationers' Register in 1631 and 1633, was published in 1634 as by "S. R." and so may have been partly by Samuel Rowley (unless the initials stand for Samuel Rowlands or some other). Finally, *The Insatiate Countess* affords an interesting problem. Published in 1613 as Marston's, it was reissued in 1631 with an attribution on some copies to Marston, and on others to Barksted. Its style is generally admitted to differ greatly from that of the purely Marstonian plays, and it does not appear in the collection of Marston's works published in 1633. It contains two lines from Barksted's poem "Myrrha." It therefore seems probable that Barksted had a hand in it, though there need be no doubt of Marston's participation.

XIII

There are a couple of plays that differ from those of the class that includes *Hey for Honesty* and *Humor out of Breath* in that, while we know that each of them is a joint production, we have no hint as to the name of any author save the one whose presence is tolerably

certain. These are *Goosecap* and *Knack to Know a Knave*, both of which are worthy studying. Of the latter all we know is that the "Merriments" of the men of Gotham are by Kemp: the bulk of the play is entirely anonymous. Of *Goosecap* all we know is that its author was dead before 1636 (see Perry's dedication to the edition of that year) and that in 1605–6 it was entered in the Stationers' Register to Blount conditionally on its being printed "according to the copy whereat Master Wilson's hand is at," wherefore as printed in 1606 it must have contained the younger Wilson's corrections, and indeed that it has undergone alteration is obvious. The critics are tolerably well agreed in looking on it as Chapman's.

XIV

I am approaching the end of my task when I come to consider plays which are conclusively attributed to certain authors, without one having any reason to suppose that the attribution is complete as well as correct. Of such are plays whose authorship rests upon their inclusion in posthumous collections. Such attributions must be regarded as in part correct but as very likely incomplete, inasmuch as the collector would not omit a play because he knew it to be partly the work of another. Such plays may prove to be to only a very small extent the work of their reputed authors. In this category appear no less than 22 of the 36 plays that figure in the first Shakspere folio. Some of these are mentioned by Meres as Shakspere's and so might be assumed to be wholly his, but in the long years that elapsed between Meres's mention of them and their appearance in the folio—their first appearance in print—there was ample opportunity for the patcher and the reviser to do their work. In the plays published in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647 other dramatists than the two named were represented, all that the inclusion of a play meant being that that play was in part at least by one or other of the pair: so too in the Shakspere folio all that is necessarily meant by the inclusion of a play is that Shakspere had a hand in writing it. It is not so with the authorized collections of Marston or Jonson, because there is a vast difference between a collection or selection made by the poet himself and one made after his death by his executors, his relatives, or those who possess the

copyright of his works. Of the "Beaumont and Fletcher" plays there are 14 that come within this category. Of four or five of these we know definitely the original authorship; but we cannot be sure that they were not rewritten later. Davenant's Works supply two—*Distresses* and *Fair Favorite*. The others in this group are *Battle of Alcazar*, passages from which are attributed to Peele in "England's Parnassus," and which may consequently be assumed to be entirely the work of that writer; *Selimus*, in which the same authority declares Greene to have had a hand, whence similarly his entire authorship may be assumed, though it was published in 1638 as by "T. G." (which might possibly stand for Thomas Green, the actor, but was more probably a blunder); *Hoffman*, published anonymously in 1631, but shown by Henslowe to have been (originally, at least) the work of Chettle; and *Fortunatus*. The very title of this comedy (*Old Fortunatus in His New Livery*) implies that it is a revision of an old play. We know that the "End for the Court" in 1599 was by Dekker; and, though the play as printed has no name on the title-page, it has Dekker's name at the end. Whether Dekker was revising a play of his own or one by another dramatist is a matter for the consideration of the student of style. To me the play seems entirely Dekker's. It must not be overlooked that Jonson is on one occasion styled "Fortunatus" and that Greene gave that name to his son.

Of all these, the plays particularly recommendable for study are the three *Henry VI* plays (in which I include the two "Contention" versions of parts 2 and 3, ascribed to Shakspere in the 1619 edition, but of doubtful authorship), *The Taming of the Shrew*, *Macbeth*, *Cymbeline*, *Henry VIII*, *Tempest*, and *Timon of Athens* (the authorship of the supposed non-Shaksperean parts of these nine plays being a matter of moment), *Selimus* (in regard to which Mr. Crawford's argument in favor of Marlowe's authorship is worthy of careful consideration), *Fair Maid of the Inn* (which as a posthumous Fletcher play is to be studied for the same reason as *The Noble Gentleman*), *Knight of Malta*, *Laws of Candy*, and *Queen of Corinth* (which three plays are the subject of some differences of opinion among "Beaumont and Fletcher" investigators), *Love's Pilgrimage* (which, according to Malone, was entered by Herbert in his diary as by

Fletcher and Shirley), and *Fortunatus*. It is strange that there has never been undertaken any thorough detailed comparison of the various scenes of the *Henry VI* trilogy and its sequel, *Richard III*, with other plays of the period. *Arden*, *Edward III*, and many others offer interesting points of resemblance; but for lack of time I must leave the work to others.

XV

The plays that remain may all be accepted as of certain authorship, unless the internal evidence is such as to cause us to doubt the external; but they are of two distinct classes—those that were obviously given to the printer by the writer or with his consent, and those of which that cannot be predicated. Even in the former case we cannot be absolutely sure of the authorship, for the claimant may have been a rogue willing to annex to himself the work of a dead comrade or a vain ass who had persuaded himself of his entire responsibility for a work in which he had only a share; but this class assuredly gives us the nearest approach to certainty that we can obtain. In the other there is no small likelihood of the publisher having been content with the name of the chief writer even when he knew there were two or more, of his being unaware that his author's work as he had it had been touched up by the players or their hacks, of his being ignorant that his author's work was based on the older work of a deceased dramatist, or even of his confusing it with some other work of similar title or on the same subject. Some of them again were published anonymously, and our knowledge of the authorship is due to references by other writers. In this connection note may be taken of Heywood's statement in the epistle that prefaces *The Rape of Lucrece*, wherein he informs us that he used to sell his copy to the players, and therefore supposed he had "no further right to print them without their consent, which is the reason that so few are in print, and that some of these plays that are so have been copied by the ear and printed uncorrect without his knowledge."

In all the cases in this class the ascriptions may be presumed to be complete, unless there be definite cause to doubt it. Among them are Fletcher's *Woman's Prize* (which Archer gives partly to

Beaumont), *Wild-Goose Chase* (which has undergone alteration), *Loyal Subject*, *M. Thomas*, *Humorous Lieutenant*, and *Rule a Wife*, Beaumont and Fletcher's *King and No King*, *Maid's Tragedy*, *Scornful Lady*, and *Philaster*, and Fletcher and Shirley's *Night-Walker* (which was published in 1640 as by Fletcher, but which undoubtedly contains the alterations known to have been made in it by Shirley). Others of this group are Grevile's two, Barry's *Ram Alley*, Berkeley's *Lost Lady*, eleven of Brome's, Anthony Brewer's *Love-sick King* (which Archer ascribes to Thomas Bernard), Cartwright's four, half a dozen of Carlell's, Chapman's *Gentleman Usher*, *Bussy*, *Blind Beggar*, *May-Day*, and *M. d'Olive* (the first-named two of which show signs of alteration), two of Davenport's, Davenant's *Siege*, *Love and Honor*, *Unfortunate Lovers*, and *News* (the last-named being obviously an alteration), Denham's *Sophy*, Dekker's *Wonder* (which has evidently undergone alteration) and *Shoemaker's Holiday*, Drue's *Duchess of Suffolk*, Field's *Amends*, Phineas Fletcher's *Sicelides*, Fisher's *Fuimus Troes*, Greene's *Friar Bacon* and *James IV* (which has certainly been altered, and which Mr. Fleay thinks in part Lodge's), Glapthorne's *Argalus*, three of Goffe's, Gough's *Strange Discovery*, Haughton's *Englishmen*, Heming's two, Heywood's *Captives* (certainly altered) and *Woman Killed*, Habington's *Queen of Aragon*, Holiday's *Technogamia*, Jonson's *Tale of a Tub* and *Devil is an Ass*, Lodge's *Wounds* (which Allot credits to "D. Lodge"), Lyly's eight, (including *Campaspe*, which as we have it, has been revised, probably by Lyly himself), Mayne's two, two of Middleton's, two of May's, Mead's *Love and Friendship*, *Jack Drum's Entertainment* (which the internal as well as the external evidence shows to be Marston's), Mundy's *John a Kent*, Marlowe's *Massacre*, Massinger's *Believe as You List* and *Guardian*, Peaps' *Love in Its Extasy*, Peele's *Arraignment* (which Kirkman and Archer attribute to Shakspere), *Edward I* (which has obviously undergone alteration), and *David*, Porter's *Two Angry Women*, Rowley's *All's Lost* (which R. and L. ascribe to Massinger) and *New Wonder* (certainly altered), Randolph's *Amyntas*, Shirley's *Coronation* ("falsely ascribed to Fletcher" as Shirley says, and clearly the later writer's both on the internal and the external evidence), Suckling's four, Tomkins' *Albumazar* and *Lingua*, Tourneur's *Atheist's Tragedy*, Tailor's *Hog*, Wilde's *Love's Hospital*, Wilde's

Benefice, the *Cobbler's Prophecy* of Robert Wilson, Sen., Arthur Wilson's *Swisser*, Wilkins' *Miseries* (certainly remodeled, probably by Wilkins himself), and Shakspere's *Othello*, *Richard II* (a quotation from which is given to Drayton in "England's Parnassus," as one from *Love's Labor's Lost* is credited to Daniel), *Richard III* (which seems to me to be partly by Kyd), *Romeo* (in which a second hand has been suspected), *The Merchant of Venice*, *Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Much Ado*, *Merry Wives* (these four having all been subjected to some revision), *Hamlet* (the earliest quarto of which may contain some of the old *Hamlet*, conjectured to be Kyd's), the two *Henry IV* plays (both altered), and *Lear*. There are moreover Marlowe and Nashe's *Dido*, the *Eastward Hoe* of Jonson, Chapman, and Marston, Massinger and Field's *Fatal Dowry*, Massinger and Dekker's *Virgin Martyr*, Markham and Sampson's *Herod*, Dekker's *Honest Whore*, part 2 (in which it is possible that Middleton may have had a hand, as he had in the first part), Mundy and Chettle's two *Robin Hood* plays (which Kirkman gives to Heywood), Greene and Lodge's *Looking-Glass*, Dekker and Webster's *Northward Hoe* and *Westward Hoe*, the *Patient Grissil* of Chettle, Dekker, and Haughton, Middleton and Rowley's *Spanish Gipsy* and *Changeling*, Dekker and Forde's *Sun's Darling*, and that *Oldcastle* of which some copies were issued in 1600 under Shakspere's name, but which Henslowe shows us to have been written by Mundy, Drayton, Hathwaye, and Wilson, Jr. The division of this play between its four authors is a pretty hopeless task. In I, 1, 2, III, 1, and perhaps IV, 4 we have one whose verse is prose cut into lengths, with a fair percentage of bad run-ons; in I, 3, II, 3, III, 4, IV, 1, and V, 9, an old-fashioned, regular versifier; in V, 1, a stiff and jerky writer. The rest of the play (including doubtfully III, 3 and IV, 2 and 3) may be set down to Drayton's credit, differing from the verse of *The Merry Devil* mainly in its freedom from rhyme. (As against this division, note that the poet's idea of the Irish idiom is shown in V, 2 in the use of "me's," while the author of V, 10 uses instead "me be.")

Grissil is ascribed in an old MS note to Chettle alone. Were it not known to have been originally the work of three writers, I should hesitate between giving it to one author (whom I should pronounce to be Dekker) and giving it to two (Dekker in that

case being credited with I, 2, II, 2, III, 1, IV, 1, 2, V, 1, and the bulk of V, 2).

There are yet others. *Troilus* has certainly been altered, and there have been many suggestions made in regard to it. Mr. Fleay has put forward the idea that it contains "débris" from an old play by Dekker and Chettle, while Mr. Boyle has argued at great length, but quite unconvincingly, in favor of Marston's participation. To me it seems that the play contains nothing that is not Shakspere's. *City Madam* is another play that has indubitably undergone alteration, but an examination of it shows no hand but Massinger's. *Very Woman*, on the other hand, though licensed in 1634 and published in 1655 as the work of Massinger, contains numerous traces of Fletcher's presence, so that the attribution to Massinger must be taken as only partly correct. It is a pity that Malone has not made it clear to us in this case as in that of *The Bashful Lover* whether or not Herbert has named Massinger as the sole author of the play.

Of all these plays the ones offering attractions to the student in questions of authorship are *Richard III*, *Hamlet*, *Lear*, *Merry Wives*, *Edward I*, *James IV*, the second part of *The Honest Whore*, *Patient Grissil*, *Wonder of a Kingdom*, *New Wonder*, and *Very Woman*.

But there remain three others of this class, all of them well worthy of attention. One is *The Cunning Lovers* published in 1654 as by Alexander Brome. As it appears in the Cockpit list of 1639, when Brome was only nineteen years old, he must have been either very precocious or nothing more than a reviser in later years. As in that list it appears between two of Heywood's plays it may on the external evidence (I have not read it) be considered a play originally by Heywood, afterward patched by Alexander Brome. The second of the three is *Titus*, the external evidence in favor of Shakspere's authorship of which is just as strong as is the evidence in favor of any of the admittedly Shaksperean dramas in this class. I do not say that the internal evidence bears out that view; in point of fact, it seems to me that there is more of Kyd than of Shakspere in the play, but certainly also, as some critics are not willing to admit, some of the ostensible author's work. But for those to whom external evidence means everything there should be no doubt of Shakspere's authorship. The only thing against it is Ravenscroft's improbable

and in all likelihood baseless tradition that it was the work of "a private author" given "some master touches" by Shakspere. This was ridiculed by Langbaine, and in any case need not be regarded as of authority. The attempt to identify this play with the *Titus and Andronicus* acted by Sussex' men at the Rose in 1593–94 is absurd, because the presence of the little word "and" which serves most effectually to differentiate them, is no mistake, as is shown by the fact that it recurs in a Stationers' Register entry as late as 1626. Moreover the play in this entry of 1626 cannot be the one in the folio, and the entry clearly infers that it is not Shakspere's, inasmuch as it speaks of "Master Pavier's right to Shakspere's plays or any of them, and *Titus and Andronicus*." Neither can the play as we have it be the *Titus and Vespasian* produced by Strange's in 1592, because there is no Vespasian in it; but, as there is a Vespasian in the German version of the play, this may have been the tragedy which Shakspere retouched. The third play is *How to Choose*, which contains such striking resemblances to Heywood's *Wise Woman* that Mr. Fleay thinks it must be his, despite the MS ascription to Joshua Cooke. Such resemblances are usually capable of two or more interpretations, and it is possible in this case to infer that some of Cooke's work is to be found in the Heywood play. Heywood's connection with Cooke is shown by his address to the latter's *Green's Tu Quoque*. This address, it may be noted, hints that Cooke is dead, but does not expressly say so. Is it possible that Joshua (or Jo.) Cooke is a myth affording a pen-name for Heywood? The circumstance, however, that his name has been written on the title-page seems to contradict the idea that he was not a real personage. It may be worthy of remark that the metre used for narrative in *How to Choose* is the same as occurs in the epilogue to *Woman Killed with Kindness*.

XVI

As the plays of the single remaining class are the only ones on which a knowledge of the respective authors' styles in various *genres* can be based with anything like absolute safety, it may be as well to indicate what ones belong to it. There are Alexander's four, Armin's *Two Maids*, Brandon's *Octavia*, Brome's *Antipodes*,

Jovial Crew, and *Weeding of Covent Garden*, Barnes's *Devil's Charter*, Baron's *Mirza*, Burnell's *Landgartha*, Chamberlayne's *Swaggering Damsel*, George Cartwright's *Heroic Lover* (a closet drama which may date from after 1642), Elizabeth Carey's *Marian*, Cowley's couple, Carlell's *Deserving Favorite*, half a dozen of Chapman's, Cokain's two, *Travels of Three Brothers* (by Day, Rowley, and Wilkins), five of Davenant's, Day's *Law Tricks* and *Isle of Gulls*, Daborne's *Christian*, Daniel's four, Davenport's *John*, four of Dekker's, Forde's seven, Freeman's *Imperiale*, Fletcher's *Faithful Shepherdess*, Field's *Woman*, Gomersal's *Sforza*, four of Glapthorne's, Heywood and Brome's *Lancashire Witches* (which may be assumed to have been given to the press by Heywood, since it has his motto on the title-page), Heywood's *Challenge* (which also carries his motto), eighteen others of his (if his *Calisto*, which I have not seen and of which I know nothing, be rightly included in this section), Harding's *Fatal Union*, Hawkins' *Apollo Shroving* (given to the press by his friend, "E. W."), Hausted's *Rival Friends*, Hughes and Fulbeck's *Arthur* (the title-page being too precise in its statement of the division of the work to permit us to doubt its authority), Jaques' *Queen of Corsica*, fifteen of Jonson's, Jordan's *Walks*, Jones's *Adrasta*, Thomas Killigrew's four, Henry Killigrew's *Pallantus*, Knevet's *Rhodon*, Kirke's *Seven Champions*, Kyd's *Cornelia*, Lower's *Phœnix*, Moore's *Arcadian Lovers* (which may possibly be of a later date), two of Marmion's, seven of Marston's, Middleton's *Witch*, Middleton and Dekker's *Roaring Girl*, ten of Massinger's, Montague's *Shepherd's Paradise*, Markham and Machin's *Dumb Knight*, Mason's *Turk*, May's *Antigone* and *Cleopatra*, Milton's *Comus*, Nabbes' half-dozen, Neale's *Ward*, Percy's six, Randolph's *Jealous Lover*, Rutter's *Shepherd's Holiday*, Rowley and Middleton's *Fair Quarrel*, Rawlins' *Rebellion*, Richards' *Messalina*, 28 of Shirley's, Strode's *Floating Island*, Stephens' *Cynthia's Revenge*, Sharpe's *Noble Stranger*, Sampson's *Vow-Breaker*, Sharpham's *Fleire*, Tatham's two, Whetstone's two, three of Webster's, *Tancred*, and Zouch's *Sophister* (which is, by the way, the same play as *Fallacy*—with considerable variations, not, however, sufficient to account for the two titles being generally referred to as applying to two different plays). There is also Samuel Rowley's *When You See Me You Know Me*, which, though it was published in 1613

without a dedication, may be deemed to have been given by him to the press, inasmuch as it describes him on the title-page as "Servant to the Prince." There is ample evidence of the authorship of all of these dramas; and we may quite ignore the attribution of Davenport's play in a MS note on one old copy to "W. Daven" (meant evidently for Davenant) or Drummond's mention of *The Faithful Shepherdess* as Beaumont and Fletcher's; nor need we attach importance to the omission of *Honor and Riches* and *The Young Admiral.* from the list of his plays which Shirley issued in 1652 (they must have been overlooked, as each has a dedication by him), or the erasure of Heywood's name and initials in an existing copy of that writer's *Golden Age;* nor yet need we worry over Oldys' note that "Ben Jonson charged Forde that *The Lover's Melancholy* was purloined from Shakespeare's papers." The inclusion of *Tancred* may cause surprise inasmuch as it was acted in 1568, but Wilmot, one of its original five authors, rewrote it, probably shortly before he published it in 1591. I put Verney's *Antipo* in this class, but I have not seen it, and do not know if this is its proper place.

Naturally enough this class offers nothing especially recommendable for our purpose save *Byron's Conspiracy,* which has certainly been greatly altered, and in which Mr. Fleay has suggested Jonson's participation. If, however, Jonson was concerned in the original draft of the play, it is likely that nothing of his work was left when it was revised prior to publication. The single-author plays of this section are, to be sure, worthy of study, but it is not because they themselves offer problems for solution, but because they make possible the solution of problems offered by other plays. They are, in short, the plays on which one may most safely ground a knowledge of the style of the various dramatists concerned in them.

To sum up, the dramas I would particularly recommend to students desirous of settling questions of authorship are:

A (unclaimed plays): *Swetnam, Queen, Love and Fortune,* the non-Shaksperean *Richard II, Stukeley, Wily Beguiled.*

B (plays unclaimed but having possibilities of specific authorship which have first to be considered): *More, Soliman, Dodipoll.*

C (plays claimed on altogether inadequate grounds): *Arden, Edward III, A Shrew.*

D (plays of diverse claims, lacking certainty): *Second Maiden's Tragedy, Pericles, Fortune by Land and Sea.*

E (plays of joint attribution, partly probable and partly of very little value): *Two Noble Kinsmen.*

F (plays as to which the evidence of authorship is strong but not quite adequate): *Revenger's Tragedy, George-a-Greene, Nero, Yorkshire Tragedy, Appius,* the first part of *Tamburlaine* (a settlement of which carries with it a settlement of the second part also), *London Prodigal, Cromwell.*

G (plays only part-authorship of which is certain): *The Shrew,* the three *Henry VI* plays, *Cymbeline, Timon of Athens.*

H (plays regarding which the external evidence is sufficient unless contradicted by the internal): *Titus, Richard III.*

Apart from such study of individual plays one of the most interesting tasks any literary detective can set himself is a search through the drama of the first quarter of the period with the object of determining whether or no there is any of the dramatic work of Watson extant. The proof of the existence of something more than the mere fragment of Nashe's dramatic work that we now possess would also be of great interest, and the discovery of Tourneur's presence elsewhere than in *The Atheist's Tragedy* would be of value as helping to prove or disprove the theory that *The Revenger's Tragedy* is his, while, finally, anything tending to elucidate the relations between Cooke and Heywood is worth some trouble to ascertain.

As to how the detection of the presence of unknown writers in any of the plays I have named is to be effected and their identity determined, that is a matter which every investigator must settle for himself. All I have sought to do here is to state the problems, not to endeavor to impose upon others my ideas of the best means of solving them.

E. H. C. OLIPHANT

LONDON